



Order F26-85

BRITISH COLUMBIA HYDRO AND POWER AUTHORITY

Carol Pakkala
Adjudicator

October 5, 2026

CanLII Cite: 2026 BCIPC 108
Quicklaw Cite: [2026] B.C.I.P.C.D. No. 108

Summary: The British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (BC Hydro) applied to the Commissioner, under s. 43 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, to disregard eight access requests. The adjudicator found that the requests were not vexatious (s. 43(a)), but they were an abuse of the right to make a request (s. 43(d)(i)) and that responding to them would unreasonably interfere with BC Hydro's operations (s. 43(c)(i)). The adjudicator authorized BC Hydro to disregard all the requests and found that future relief was warranted.

Statutes Considered: *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, RSBC 1996 c 165, ss. 43(a), 43(c)(i), and 43(d)(i).

INTRODUCTION

[1] This inquiry decides an application made by the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (BC Hydro) to the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC). BC Hydro applied for authorization under s. 43 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (FIPPA)¹ to disregard eight access requests made by an individual (respondent).

[2] BC Hydro's original s. 43 application² sought relief under s. 43(b) (records have been disclosed or accessible from another source) and s. 43(c)(ii) (unreasonable interference with operations because requests are repetitious or systematic).

¹ From this point forward, unless otherwise specified, where I refer to section numbers, I am referring to sections of FIPPA.

² Application dated April 14, 2026.

[3] After BC Hydro filed its s. 43 application and before the due date for submissions in this inquiry, s. 43 was amended by the Legislature. BC Hydro made its initial submissions on s. 43 as amended. BC Hydro now relies upon s. 43(a) (frivolous or vexatious), s. 43(c)(i) (unreasonable interference with operations), and s. 43(d)(i) (abuse of the right of access because it is repetitious or systematic) as I will discuss below.

[4] Both parties made written inquiry submissions.

Preliminary Matters

Amendments to s. 43

[5] On May 28, 2026, the Legislature introduced amendments to s. 43 that apply to requests received before, on or after that date.³

[6] Section 43 now reads as follows with the amendments indicated in bold:

Power to authorize a public body to disregard a request

43 If the head of a public body asks, the commissioner may authorize the public body to disregard a request under section 5 or 29, including because

(a) the request is frivolous or vexatious,

(a.1) the behaviour of the applicant is abusive or malicious,

(b) the request is for a record that has been disclosed to the applicant or that is accessible by the applicant from another source,

(c) responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of

(i) the public body, or

(ii) the ministry of the minister responsible for this Act, or

(d) the request is

(i) an abuse of the right to make a request under section 5 or 29 because the request is repetitious or systematic, or

(ii) excessively broad.

³ Bill 9 – *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Amendment Act, 2026* (hereinafter referred to as Bill 9) received Royal Assent on May 28, 2026. See s. 12 of Bill 9. For a full legislative history and complete text of Bill 9 see: https://www.leg.bc.ca/parliamentary-business/overview/43rd-parliament/2nd-session/bills/3rd_read/gov09-3.htm.

[7] The amendments mean that s. 43(c) is now its own ground for the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard an access request.⁴ Further, s. 43(d)(i) adds a new ground for the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard an access request.

[8] Since the amendments to s. 43, two orders have been issued that include an interpretation of the new s. 43(d)(i).⁵ I considered whether fairness required the opportunity for further submissions on these orders and decided it did not. In my view, these orders essentially reframed and built upon factors previously considered to determine whether requests are systematic. The orders then assessed whether together, those factors indicated an abuse of the right to make an access request.

[9] After reviewing the submissions of the parties, I am satisfied both parties already had an adequate opportunity to be heard on the factors for consideration under s. 43(d)(i). BC Hydro's initial submission and affidavit evidence directly address those factors⁶ and the respondent had the opportunity to respond. For these reasons, I am satisfied that fairness does not require an additional round of submissions in these circumstances.

Matters under consideration in this inquiry

[10] The only issue in the notice of the hearing of this application is s. 43. However, the respondent asks that I consider whether disclosure is in the public interest under s. 25.⁷ The respondent also alleges that BC Hydro failed to search for the requested records and it should be ordered to do so in compliance with its duties under s. 6(1).⁸ These issues are outside the scope of this inquiry, so I will not consider them.

[11] Additionally, the respondent devotes almost his entire response submission and supporting exhibits to his safety concerns related to the exposure of a BC Hydro duct bank⁹ during a construction project. The resolution of those concerns is not a matter that falls within the scope of FIPPA.

[12] For clarity, I have only considered the respondent's submission and exhibits as they relate to s. 43, because that is the only issue in this inquiry.

⁴ Previously, unreasonable interference with a public body's operations had to be the result of an access request being repetitious or systematic, or excessively broad.

⁵ Order F26-72, 2026 BCIPC 91 (CanLII) and Order F26-79, 2026 BCIPC 98 (CanLII).

⁶ Order F26-72, 2026 BCIPC 91 (CanLII) at para 86 adopted in Order F26-79, 2026 BCIPC 98 (CanLII) at para 35.

⁷ Respondent's submission, pp. 3 and 10.

⁸ Respondent's submission, pp. 3 and 9.

⁹ Both parties alternately refer to the duct bank as "duct bank" and "infrastructure". I understand both terms to mean the concrete encasement of underground electrical wires. Throughout this order, the references to the duct bank are to the one exposed during excavation.

BACKGROUND

[13] BC Hydro is a provincial Crown corporation¹⁰ responsible for generating, purchasing, distributing, and selling electricity.

[14] The respondent is a construction safety officer. He has concerns about what he perceived to be a safety violation during excavation for a construction project in May of 2024 (the Project). The respondent's concerns relate to the exposure of a BC Hydro duct bank¹¹ during excavation (the Incident).

[15] Someone contacted BC Hydro about the Incident, and it investigated by visiting the Project site (the Trouble Call). BC Hydro satisfied itself that, while the duct bank had been exposed by workers performing work unrelated to BC Hydro, there did not appear to be any damage or disturbance to it. BC Hydro also satisfied itself that the duct bank was safe (i.e., that the concrete encasement performed its function as an effective barrier).¹²

[16] Since October of 2024, the respondent has submitted to BC Hydro 20 access requests, many with multiple parts, related to the Incident. The eight requests that BC Hydro seeks permission to disregard are dated between March 7 and May 5, 2026. From this point forward, I will refer to these as the Outstanding Requests.

ISSUES AND BURDEN OF PROOF

[17] The issues I must decide in this inquiry are as follows:

1. Are the Outstanding Requests frivolous or vexatious under s. 43(a)?
2. Would responding to the Outstanding Requests unreasonably interfere with the operations of BC Hydro under s. 43(c)(i)?
3. Are the Outstanding Requests “an abuse of the right to make a request” because they are repetitious or systematic under s. 43(d)(i)?
4. If the answer to one or more of issues 1, 2 or 3 above is yes, what remedy, if any, is appropriate?

[18] As the party applying for relief under s. 43, BC Hydro bears the burden of proving that it applies.¹³

¹⁰ Continued under the *Hydro and Power Authority Act*, RSBC 1996, c 212.

¹¹ All references to the duct bank in this order refer to the duct bank exposed in the Incident.

¹² Affidavit of BC Hydro's Manager of Freedom of Information and Privacy (Manager) at para 20.

¹³ Order F18-09, 2018 BCIPC 11 (CanLII) at para 2; Order F17-18, 2017 BCIPC 19 at para 4; and Auth. (s. 43) 02-02, [2002] BCIPCD No. 57 available at <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/documents/decisions/160>.

DISCUSSION

The access requests

[19] To assess BC Hydro's s. 43 application, I consider below both the Outstanding Requests and earlier requests to which BC Hydro has already responded (Earlier Requests).

[20] Most of the requests are difficult to understand because they are multi-part, quite lengthy and detailed, and contain long lists of various types of records and numerous questions and editorial comments. However, I include my best efforts at a summary of all his Earlier and Outstanding Requests in an appendix to this order. Here, I will provide only an overview of those requests.

[21] Since October of 2024, I can see that the respondent made 20 access requests, most of which are multi-part requests.¹⁴ I can also see that the volume and frequency of those requests increased this year with 12 of the 20 (including the eight Outstanding Requests) being made between January 21 and May 5, 2026.¹⁵

[22] The Earlier Requests were all for records related to the Incident, including records about the duct bank, the Project, the Trouble Call, general safety protocols for the type of circumstances that occurred in the Incident, and about BC Hydro's submission to the British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) in response to the respondent's complaint about the Incident.

[23] The Outstanding Requests also concern the Incident and include requests for records about the duct bank, the Project, the Trouble Call, and general safety protocols for the type of circumstances that occurred in the Incident.

[24] Both the Earlier Requests and the Outstanding Requests were followed by communications from the respondent to BC Hydro. For example, one of the Earlier Requests was for all records associated with the Project and involved 225 pages of back and forth email correspondence about it.¹⁶

Section 43

[25] Section 43 gives the Commissioner the power to grant the extraordinary remedy of authorizing a public body to disregard an access request. Public

¹⁴ Manager's affidavit at para 4 and attached Exhibits which are the email requests from the respondent.

¹⁵ Manager's affidavit at paras 35-80.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, at para 39.

bodies do not have the authority to disregard access requests on their own; they must obtain permission to do so from the Commissioner.¹⁷

[26] As noted above, s. 43 was recently amended and BC Hydro now relies on ss. 43(a) (frivolous or vexatious); 43(c)(i) (responding to the requests would unreasonably interfere with its operations), and 43(d)(i) (the requests are an abuse of the right to make a request because they are repetitious or systematic).

[27] Section 43 serves an important purpose by guarding against abuses of the right of access. Misuse of the right of access by one person can threaten or diminish the legitimate exercise of that same right by others. Abusing the right of access also harms the public interest, since it unnecessarily adds to public bodies' costs of complying with FIPPA.¹⁸ In this way, s. 43 is an important tool for curbing abuses of the right of access.¹⁹

[28] Section 43 is remedial, not punitive in nature.²⁰ It is not a mechanism for public bodies to avoid their obligations under FIPPA. Section 43 applications require careful consideration because granting this relief curtails or eliminates the rights of access to information created by the Legislature through FIPPA.²¹

Parties' submissions – s. 43

[29] BC Hydro says the respondent's requests are an abuse of the right to make a request because they are both repetitious and systematic; that responding to them would unreasonably interfere with its operations; and that they are vexatious.²²

[30] The respondent says BC Hydro's s. 43 application is in bad faith and seeks to block his access to documents.²³ The respondent further says his requests are evidence-based, made for legitimate investigative purposes, and cannot reasonably be characterized as frivolous, vexatious, or an abuse of the right of access.²⁴

¹⁷ Order F18-25, 2018 BCIPC 28 at para 14.

¹⁸ Auth (s. 43) 99-01, p. 8. Available at <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/documents/decisions/158>.

¹⁹ *Crocker v British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1997 CanLII 4406 (BC SC) at para 33 [Crocker].

²⁰ *Crocker*, *ibid* at para 32.

²¹ Auth (s. 43) 99-01, *supra* note 18, p. 3.

²² BC Hydro's initial submission at para 52.

²³ Respondent's submission, p. 1.

²⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 3 and 11.

Section 43(d)(i) – abuse of the right to make a request because the request is systematic or repetitious

[31] Section 43(d)(i) gives the commissioner discretion to authorize a public body to disregard an access request that is an abuse of the right to make a request because it is repetitious or systematic.

[32] While s. 43(d)(i) and the “abuse of the right to make a request” language is new to s. 43, the “repetitious or systematic” language is the same as what was in s. 43(c)(ii) prior to the amendments.²⁵ Similarly, the overarching concept of “abuse” is not new.

[33] Previous orders and decisions have considered “abuse” in the context of an abuse of process.²⁶ Generally speaking, “abuse” includes using a process or exercising rights for improper purposes. Further, abuse does not require malicious intent; it can stem from genuinely held beliefs and a desire to obtain a fair outcome in a dispute.²⁷

[34] The OIPC has long defined systematic requests as ones made according to a method or plan of acting that is organized and carried out according to a set of rules or principles.²⁸ Whether systematic requests are an abuse of the right of access has recently been considered in two orders in the following manner:

[T]he addition of the language “abuse of the right to make a request” recognizes that not every request made in accordance with a system is an abuse of the right to make a request. Rather, an abuse occurs when there is an underlying pattern that is itself indicative of a misuse of the right to make a request.

Ultimately, what constitutes an abuse of the right to make a request because it is systematic is open-ended and depends on the specific facts and circumstances of each case. The focus should be on the nature and magnitude of the pattern of requests. Accordingly, in considering whether the requests before me are an abuse of the right to make a request because they are systematic, I will consider whether:

- The request is made according to a method or plan of acting that is organized and carried out according to a set of rules or principles; and
- The pattern of requests indicates a misuse of the right to make a request, some indicia of which may include, but are not limited to:

²⁵ The former s. 43(c)(ii) allowed the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard a request where “responding to the request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the public body because the request is repetitious or systematic”.

²⁶ See for example: Decision F25-04, 2025 BCIPC 78 (CanLII); Order F26-32, 2026 BCIPC 40 (CanLII) at para 27, citing Decision F10-07, 2010 BCIPC 37 (CanLII) at para 17 and Order F23-23, 2023 BCIPC 27 (CanLII) at paras 38-39.

²⁷ Decision F25-04, 2025 BCIPC 78 (CanLII) at para 10.

²⁸ Order F26-72, 2026 BCIPC 91 (CanLII) at para 78 and Auth. (s. 43) 99-01, *supra* note 18, p. 3.

- using information received in response to an access request to make future access requests or complaints to prolong the dispute with a public body;
- revisiting earlier access requests;
- an increase in volume or frequency of the requests over time;
- behaviour suggesting that a respondent has no intention of stopping the flow of requests and questions, all of which relate to essentially the same records, communications, people and events; and
- routinely raising issues with the public body about their responses to freedom of information requests, and then often taking those issues to review by the OIPC.

[87] Finally, in order to determine whether the request(s) at issue are an abuse of the right of access because they are systematic, I must look at the whole pattern of requests including previous requests and the requests I have found to be frivolous, above.²⁹

[35] I agree with this interpretation and the reasons given for it, and I adopt it here. In my view, it establishes a two part test. The first part looks at whether there is a plan or method of acting that establishes the requests are systematic, and the second part looks at whether the pattern of the requests demonstrates a misuse of the right to make a request.

Parties' submissions – s. 43(d)(i)

[36] BC Hydro says the requests are an abuse because they:

- repeatedly seek the same information in different forms, requiring it to expend resources determining what has been previously requested;³⁰
- are repetitive, overlapping, and frequently revised or expanded after BC Hydro's response;³¹
- springboard off earlier responses to generate further requests on the same subject matter but with different wording or more granular information;³²
- repeatedly attempt to obtain records when BC Hydro has already responded that there were no responsive records;³³
- create an interconnected web of requests consisting of requests that are repeatedly altered and expanded mid-process, requiring it to revisit work already completed;³⁴ and

²⁹ Order F26-72, 2026 BCIPC 72 (CanLII) at paras 85-87 and Order F26-79, 2026 BCIPC 98 (CanLII) at paras 35-36.

³⁰ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 86.

³¹ *Ibid* at para 87.

³² *Ibid* at para 88.

³³ *Ibid* at para 89.

³⁴ *Ibid* at paras 89-90.

- continue to press allegations of wrongdoing with respect to the Incident;³⁵
- tie up resources by requiring BC Hydro to repeatedly address the same subject matter;³⁶ and
- disproportionately consume resources at the expense of other applicants.³⁷

[37] The respondent says his requests cannot reasonably be characterized as an abuse of the right of access.³⁸ He also says that the records he has obtained “demonstrate a reasonable evidentiary basis for believing that additional identifiable operational records may exist”.³⁹

Analysis – s. 43(d)(i)

[38] For the reasons given below, I find that all of the Outstanding Requests are an abuse of the right to make a request because they are systematic.

[39] At the outset of this analysis, I accept that the respondent holds genuine concerns about safety arising from the Incident. I also accept that he believes his requests are for legitimate investigative purposes and not to harass BC Hydro.⁴⁰ However, I note that s. 43(d)(i) is not about whether the respondent is well intentioned and motivated by sincere safety concerns. Abuse in this context does not require malicious intent and it can stem from genuinely held beliefs.⁴¹ In my view, s. 43(d)(i) is about the cumulative impact of his behaviour, not his intent or motivation.

Are the Outstanding Requests systematic (i.e., is there a plan or method of acting)?

[40] To decide if the Outstanding Requests are systematic, all of the requests, including the Earlier Requests, are relevant.⁴² From the wording of all of those requests, it is clear to me that the respondent is using the FIPPA access process to seek answers to his key questions about whether the duct bank was energized when it was exposed in the Incident and what BC Hydro knew or did in response.

[41] I find that the respondent has acted in the following ways which, when viewed as a whole, amount to a method of acting that is systematic:

³⁵ *Ibid* at para 92.

³⁶ *Ibid* at para 93.

³⁷ *Ibid* at para 94.

³⁸ Respondent's submission, p. 10.

³⁹ *Ibid*.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, p. 2.

⁴¹ Decision F25-04, 2025 BCIPC 78 (CanLII) at para 10.

⁴² Auth. (s. 43) 02-01 at para 24 available at <https://www.oipc.bc.ca/documents/decisions/159>.

- continuously making multi-part requests;
- repeatedly requesting records related to the one Incident and asking in different ways, presumably in the hope of getting records that will give him different answers to his questions, such as by using slightly different wordings,⁴³ asking for records by different categories,⁴⁴ and naming different people;⁴⁵
- routinely building on previous requests and cross referencing the same subject matter (i.e. the Project, the duct bank and its energized status, and the Trouble Call);
- frequently altering and expanding requests mid-process;⁴⁶ and
- regularly inquiring and asking follow-up questions about his requests.

[42] Based on the above methods of acting, I find that the first part of the test is satisfied and that the Outstanding Requests are systematic.

Does the plan or method of acting demonstrate an abuse of the right to make an access request?

[43] The Outstanding Requests were made in the context of what I have found above to be the respondent's methodical way of making requests. For the sake of simplicity, from this point forward, I will refer to these methods as the "pattern".

[44] I find that the pattern is an abuse of the right to make an access request for three reasons. While each reason may not be sufficient on its own to establish abuse, together, and in these particular circumstances, I find they do.

[45] First, the pattern is to consistently return to the same Incident. Second, the pattern is to repeat and reframe his requests. Third, the pattern is to use access requests irresponsibly and excessively. I look at each of these reasons next.

⁴³ For example, "any records confirming determination that the duct bank was energized" in one request versus "formal documentation showing whether the duct bank was de-energized, isolated, or otherwise altered" in another.

⁴⁴ For example, system asset management (SAM) testing records showing the energized status of the duct bank versus the energized status of the duct bank.

⁴⁵ Without identifying particular individuals, I can see that in June 2025, the respondent requested all internal emails about the duct bank involving BC Hydro staff and names four individuals. In the Outstanding Requests, he names two of those same individuals and adds five more, again for their communications about the duct bank, SAM system interpretation, and civil construction and safety concerns.

⁴⁶ Manager's affidavit at paras 53-63. On March 20, 2026 in particular, the respondent further clarified and expanded several requests made that same day.

1. Returning to the same Incident

[46] The pattern shows the respondent returns to the same Incident. He does so by using tactics which I find together are indicative of abuse. The first is springboarding.⁴⁷

[47] Springboarding involves using information received in response to one access request to make additional requests. While there are many examples of the respondent doing this, I include here only a sampling. I find that the respondent engaged in “springboarding” when he:

- received responsive records and made a new request the next day;⁴⁸
- expressed his belief that records from an earlier request confirmed his suspicions about worksite conditions and supported his new request for more records about those matters;⁴⁹
- used what he perceived as a faulty response to essentially repeat his earlier request with commentary about what he thinks BC Hydro needs to include the second time around;⁵⁰
- used information received in response to previous requests to provide what he called “context” for new requests;⁵¹
- used what he called the “final clarification” found in previously disclosed records to repeat the request but in a way that expanded it to include “all records” or “complete disclosure” including updates and previously undisclosed materials;⁵²
- made access requests founded on BC Hydro’s own emails⁵³ and inconsistencies that he found in its operational records.⁵⁴

[48] I find that all of the above is springboarding.

[49] In addition to springboarding, the respondent also engaged in what I will call “stacking”. Stacking means making an access request and within days, sometimes even on the same day, sending another request that repeats and expands upon the first request, often in considerable detail. In my view, the respondent seems to lose track of his previous requests and simply requests

⁴⁷ Springboarding is an indicator of an abuse of process: Decision F25-04, 2025 BCIPC 78 (CanLII) at para 11.

⁴⁸ Manager’s affidavit at paras 36-37 and Exhibits G and H.

⁴⁹ *Ibid* at para 46 and Exhibit N.

⁵⁰ *Ibid* at para 63 and Exhibit W.

⁵¹ *Ibid* at para 70 and Exhibit CC.

⁵² *Ibid* at para 72 and Exhibit EE.

⁵³ Respondent’s submission, p. 4.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, p. 2.

more records in light of what he has been thinking about the Incident in the intervening hours or days.⁵⁵

[50] One specific example of stacking is the respondent's March 20, 2026 request. In that request, the respondent asks for, among a lengthy list of other records, ALL SAM (system asset management) verification outputs for 12NEL315.⁵⁶ Three days later, the respondent again requested SAM verification outputs for 12NEL315.⁵⁷ Later that same day, he again requested the SAM verification outputs for 12NEL315.⁵⁸ All of these came in what soon became a stack of email requests.

[51] I find that this springboarding and stacking behaviour of returning to the same Incident is indicative of an abuse of the right of access.

2. Repeating and reframing requests

[52] The respondent also has a pattern of repeating and reframing past access request as new requests, seemingly in the hope of yielding different results. In my view, these actions are for one of two reasons. Either he does not accept A: what the information he has received from BC Hydro says about the Incident, or B: the possibility that the information he is searching for may not exist.

[53] Broadly speaking, the respondent's pattern of repeating and reframing requests is evident in that he continues to request records about the Incident even though his Earlier Requests cover the core records about it. Further, he also repeats requests after BC Hydro already responded that there were no responsive records. For example, the respondent requested records about whether BC Hydro had notified residents in the area of the Incident about a planned or actual electrical isolation of the duct bank.⁵⁹ BC Hydro replied that there were no responsive records.⁶⁰ Despite this response, the respondent again requested all records of notification to residents.⁶¹

[54] Whatever the reason for the respondent's actions of reframing and repeating requests, it seems to me he maintains his own opinion about the Incident even when presented with objective information, records, or

⁵⁵ For example, the respondent would send requests and follow-up later saying things such as: "I am writing to follow up and clarify my Freedom of Information request;" (January 21, 2026 request); "I am writing to clarify and expand upon my previous FOI request;" (March 20, 2026 request); and "I am writing to expand my existing FOI request." (March 23, 2026 request). These statements were followed by the addition of requests for more records.

⁵⁶ Manager's affidavit at para 62 and Exhibit V.

⁵⁷ *Ibid* at para 64 and Exhibit X.

⁵⁸ *Ibid* at para 65 and Exhibit Y.

⁵⁹ *Ibid* at para 52.

⁶⁰ *Ibid* at para 53.

⁶¹ *Ibid* at para 64.

correspondence that does not accord with it. Such conduct, where he has already received reasonable and objectively complete responses to his requests, frustrates the purposes of FIPPA.⁶²

[55] While I recognize that the respondent does not agree with BC Hydro's responses to his requests, reframing and repeating them was objectively unreasonable. The appropriate avenue to contest those responses was to complain to the OIPC under s. 6 or a request a review. Instead, the respondent chose to keep peppering BC Hydro with more requests. He also chose to:

- contact a BC Hydro employee on LinkedIn;⁶³
- email BC Hydro's former Chief Executive Officer (CEO);⁶⁴
- engage in a lengthy telephone debate with BC Hydro's Contact Centre;⁶⁵
- file complaints about BC Hydro with the BCUC⁶⁶ and the Comptroller General of BC;⁶⁷ and
- post publicly on Facebook alleging he "[c]aught BC Hydro orchestrate [sic] mechanical excavation directly on top of an energized (12kV) BC Hydro duct bank".⁶⁸

[56] The purpose of FIPPA is not to facilitate repeated and reframed requests for records simply because an access applicant disagrees with the response to earlier requests.

[57] I find that the respondent's pattern of repeating and reframing access requests is indicative of an abuse of the right of access.

3. Irresponsible and excessive use

[58] The respondent's pattern also reveals what I find to be an irresponsible and excessive use of access requests. While FIPPA grants the public a right of access to records,⁶⁹ this right is not unfettered. Section 43 guards against abuses of that right. Using the right of access irresponsibly and excessively is, in my view, indicative of abuse. Such use also displays a lack of regard for the impact of one's actions.

⁶² For a similar analysis in the context of abuse, see Decision F25-04, 2025 BCIPC 78 (CanLII) at para 31.

⁶³ Manager's affidavit, Exhibit A.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, Exhibit B.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, Exhibit C is a seven-page transcript of the call.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, Exhibits D and E.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, Exhibit F.

⁶⁸ *Ibid* at para 29.

⁶⁹ Section 2(a).

[59] In my view, the respondent's pattern was irresponsible in that it resulted in considerable and unnecessary additional work for BC Hydro. This work included deciphering and untangling wordy, multi-part requests only for BC Hydro to then discover they were overlapping and repetitive. One clear example is the February 12, 2026 request for access to a broad range of records related to the duct bank including field verification records, mapping and circuit identification, logs, and communications.⁷⁰ Then, on both March 20 and 23, 2026, the respondent again requested the same information.⁷¹

[60] The respondent's pattern of requests is also excessive in my view, because of the increasing volume and frequency. The respondent made eight of the Earlier Requests in a period of just over a year.⁷² The respondent made the remaining four of the Earlier Requests⁷³ and all eight of the Outstanding Requests⁷⁴ in a period of just over four months this year. In my view, this marked acceleration of requests indicates the respondent has no intention of stopping.

[61] Outside of the requests, the respondent also demonstrated irresponsibility and excess in his follow-up communications about the requests. It is not reasonable, in my view, to expect that BC Hydro has the capacity to continually engage with him. The respondent's persistent demands for BC Hydro to do so means fewer resources to assist other access applicants. In that way the respondent's unreasonable behaviour adversely impacts the rights of other access applicants. Such behaviour crosses the line from a persistent pursuit of information into an abuse of the right to access that information.

[62] I find the respondent's irresponsible and excessive use of access requests is indicative of an abuse of the right of access.

Summary – abuse of the right of access

[63] For all of the above reasons, I find the Outstanding Requests are an abuse of the right to make a request because they are systematic. I find the respondent's method of acting establishes the Outstanding Requests are systematic. Further, I find the respondent continued to request records about the one Incident; to make repeated and reframed requests; and demonstrated irresponsible and excessive use of access requests. Together, I find these factors are indicative of abuse.

⁷⁰ Manager's affidavit at para 73.

⁷¹ *Ibid* at paras 63-65 and Exhibits W-Z.

⁷² October 16, 2024; November 7, 2024, February 17, 2025, February 25, 2025, March 18, 2025, April 30, 2025, June 9, 2025, and November 4, 2025.

⁷³ January 1, 2026, January 21, 2026, February 9, 2026, and February 11, 2026.

⁷⁴ March 7, 2026, March 23-26, 2026 (expanding 00480), March 29, 2026, April 1, 2, and 5, 2026 (expanding 00491), April 8, 2026, April 18, 2026, April 27, 2026, and May 5, 2026.

[64] I turn next to the matter of whether the Outstanding Requests are vexatious.

Vexatious - s. 43(a)

[65] Section 43(a) allows the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard an access request because the request is frivolous or vexatious. Here, BC Hydro says the respondent's requests are vexatious.

[66] Vexatious requests include those made in bad faith, such as for a malicious purpose or for the purpose of harassing or obstructing the public body.

[67] Past orders have found requests to be vexatious in the following circumstances:

- The purpose of the requests was to pressure the public body into changing a decision or taking an action;
- The respondent was motivated by a desire to harass the public body;
- The intent of the requests was to express displeasure with the public body or to criticize the public body's actions; and
- The request was intended to be punitive and to cause hardship to an employee of a public body.⁷⁵

[68] Evidence of ill will between the parties is not enough, on its own, to support a finding that an access request is vexatious.⁷⁶

Are the requests vexatious?

[69] BC Hydro says the respondent's conduct is vexatious within the meaning of s. 43 because his Outstanding Requests form part of a broader pattern of conduct that goes beyond what may have started as a legitimate effort to access records.⁷⁷

[70] BC Hydro points to a number of indicators to support its position, including that:

- the requests were not made in isolation, but rather as part of an ongoing effort by the respondent to challenge its conclusions about the Incident and to advance the respondent's underlying agenda;⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Order F22-08, 2022 BCIPC 8 (CanLII), at paras 81-83, and the decisions cited therein.

⁷⁶ Order F21-34, 2021 BCIPC 412 (CanLII) at para 56.

⁷⁷ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 106.

⁷⁸ *Ibid* at para 107.

- the tone and content of the requests is accusatory;⁷⁹
- the requests demonstrate a continual seeking of confirmation of the same underlying facts;⁸⁰ and
- the increased scale, frequency, intensity, and persistence of the respondent's requests points to his ulterior motive which is to uncover some broader illegal scheme.⁸¹

[71] The respondent says the requests were made for legitimate investigative purposes, not to harass BC Hydro.⁸²

Analysis - s. 43(a)

[72] For the reasons that follow, I find that the Outstanding Requests are not vexatious because they were not made for improper purposes.

[73] An access applicant's intent for making a request is relevant in assessing applications for relief under s. 43(a). If the intent of an access request is to vex a public body rather than to seek access to the information, s. 43 relief is available.⁸³

[74] In my view, the respondent's intent is to seek access to information he either genuinely believes to exist or refuses to believe does not exist. From the totality of his submission, I can see that the respondent holds genuine, safety concerns about the Incident. Holding genuine concerns does not translate directly to such concerns being valid and based on facts. My role though, is not to decide whether his concerns are valid. My role, under s. 43(a) is to decide whether his Outstanding Requests are vexatious.

[75] BC Hydro says the Outstanding Requests are indicative of an ulterior motive that goes beyond a legitimate motive of seeking access to information. I considered BC Hydro's arguments about how the requests seek the same information and have increased in scale and frequency. I am not persuaded that these arguments support a finding here that the respondent has a vexatious motive. Instead, I think these arguments support what BC Hydro itself describes as the respondent's hyper-focus on the Incident.⁸⁴ His motive in making the requests seems to me, to get information he genuinely believes exists.

[76] I turn next to the matter of the tone of the requests. Previous orders have identified tone as a relevant consideration under s. 43(a).⁸⁵ BC Hydro says the

⁷⁹ *Ibid* at para 108.

⁸⁰ *Ibid* at para 109.

⁸¹ *Ibid* at para 110 and BC Hydro's reply submission at para 35.

⁸² Respondent's submission, p. 2.

⁸³ Order F25-14, 2025 BCIPC 17 (CanLII) at para 33.

⁸⁴ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 2.

⁸⁵ See for example, Order F19-44, 2019 BCIPC 50 at para 32.

tone of the requests is assertive or accusatory. In support, it cites the respondent's use of words such as "unauthorized" and "high-risk" and his suggestion of systemic failures or misconduct.⁸⁶ I am not persuaded that the respondent's tone in the requests is vexatious. To the contrary, in my view, the respondent's tone is largely professional and polite. While I can see that certain assumptions underlie the use of "unauthorized" and "high-risk", I am not persuaded that the use of this language alone is vexatious in tone.

[77] For all of the reasons above, I am not persuaded that the Outstanding Requests are vexatious within the meaning of s. 43(a).

Section 43(c)(i) - unreasonable interference with the public body's operations

[78] Section 43(c)(i) allows the Commissioner to authorize a public body to disregard an access request because responding to it would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the public body.

[79] As I noted at the outset, s. 43(c)(i) was recently amended to become its own basis for authorization to disregard an access request. The previous section 43(c) required a public body to prove that responding to an access request would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the public body because the request was repetitious or systematic, or excessively broad.

[80] Deciding what constitutes unreasonable interference with a public body's operations rests on an objective assessment of the facts. This assessment will vary depending on the size and nature of the public body's operation.⁸⁷ Further, previous orders have considered the impact of responding to the request on the rights of other access applicants.⁸⁸

[81] BC Hydro says responding to the Outstanding Requests will unreasonably interfere with its operations because they require extensive and repeated allocation of specialized staff time, disrupt ongoing work, create duplication and inefficiency through repeated scope changes, and divert resources from other statutory and operational responsibilities.⁸⁹

[82] BC Hydro provides affidavit evidence from two of its managers involved in the processing of access requests. From this evidence, and from the respondent's own communications to BC Hydro, I am persuaded that BC Hydro

⁸⁶ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 108 citing the Manager's affidavit at para 77 and Exhibit II.

⁸⁷ *Crocker*, *supra* note 19 at para 37.

⁸⁸ Order F23-61, 2023 BCIPC 71 at para 61; Order F17-18, 2017 BCIPC 19 at para 40; and Order F13-18, 2013 BCIPC 25 at para 31.

⁸⁹ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 102.

has already spent a considerable amount of time, 252 hours to be precise,⁹⁰ responding to the respondent's Earlier Requests and follow-up inquiries.

[83] Based on the evidence of the time required for responding to the Earlier Requests, I also accept BC Hydro's estimate that it will take at least 110 hours to respond to the Outstanding Requests.⁹¹

[84] In particular, due to many of the Earlier Requests being repetitive and overlapping, the responses to them unnecessarily consumed additional resources. I am persuaded that responding to the Outstanding Requests will similarly require the unnecessary consumption of additional resources as many of them are also repetitive and overlapping requests.

[85] In my view, responding to the Outstanding Requests will have an adverse impact on BC Hydro's ability to respond to other access applicants. I accept BC Hydro's evidence that the requests made by the respondent between February and March of 2026 accounted for 10% of all the access requests received by BC Hydro in that period.⁹² For a single applicant to consume that proportion of resources is, in my view, not reasonable.

[86] Taking all of the above together, I am persuaded that responding to the Outstanding Requests would unreasonably interfere with BC Hydro's operations.

Summary – s. 43

[87] In summary, I have found that the Outstanding Requests are an abuse of the right of access because they are systematic under s. 43(d)(i) and that responding to them would unreasonably interfere with BC Hydro's operations under s. 43(c)(i). Given this, I turn next to the issue of what relief, if any, is appropriate.

What relief, if any, is appropriate?

[88] Section 43 relief is discretionary, and previous orders have established that it includes relief from future requests.⁹³ Further, the relief must be proportionate to the harm.⁹⁴

[89] I found above that the Outstanding Requests are an abuse of the right of access because they are systematic. I further found that responding to the

⁹⁰ 252 hours based on Manager's affidavit at paras 32-33 and Senior Distribution Design Manager's affidavit at para 27.

⁹¹ Manager's affidavit at para 90 and Senior Distribution Design Manager's affidavit at para 27.

⁹² *Ibid* at para 13.

⁹³ *Crocker supra* note 19 at para 40.

⁹⁴ *Ibid* at para 45.

Outstanding Requests would unreasonably interfere with BC Hydro's operations. Given these findings, I authorize BC Hydro to disregard all the Outstanding Requests.

[90] BC Hydro also requests that I authorize it to disregard any requests the respondent made between the date of the last of the eight Outstanding Requests and the date of this order.⁹⁵ From the evidence before me, I am satisfied that all of the respondent's requests follow the same systematic pattern. For this reason, I have decided that it is appropriate to also authorize BC Hydro to disregard additional requests made by the Respondent from May 5, 2026 to the date of this Order.

[91] As for any requests that the respondent may make in the future, BC Hydro asks that I authorize it to respond to one outstanding access request at a time for a period of two years.⁹⁶ The respondent does not comment specifically on relief, but I understand him to oppose the request.

[92] In my view, future relief is appropriate in these circumstances for several reasons. First, the evidence clearly demonstrates an abuse of the right to make an access request, and I see no indication that this abuse will stop. Second, I see no willingness on the part of the respondent to work with BC Hydro and accept feedback on making his access requests. Instead, the respondent's own words in his emails to BC Hydro demonstrate that he has no intention of stopping the flow of requests and questions. The requests continue to be about an Incident that happened more than two years ago and there is minimal likelihood of new responsive records.

[93] The right of access to information should only be used responsibly. Misuse by one person can threaten or diminish the legitimate access right of others and thus, must not be tolerated.⁹⁷ I found that the respondent not only misused the right of access, but further, that he abused that right. It is also readily apparent to me the respondent did not consider the impact of those actions.

[94] I have found that the respondent's Outstanding Requests are an abuse of the right of access because they are systematic. I am satisfied that any future access requests from the respondent are likely to also be part of that same pattern. I have decided to grant a remedy that will hopefully break that pattern. In my view, a time limited complete restriction will best serve the purposes of s. 43.

⁹⁵ BC Hydro's reply submission at para 49(b).

⁹⁶ BC Hydro's initial submission at para 113.

⁹⁷ Auth (s. 43) 99-01, *supra* note 18, p. 8.

I recognize that such a restriction is serious.⁹⁸ However, I find it is proportionate and warranted⁹⁹ in the particular circumstances before me.¹⁰⁰

[95] For all of the above reasons, I find that it is reasonable to authorize BC Hydro, for a period of one year from the date of this order, to disregard any access request under s. 5 of FIPPA made by the respondent or on his behalf. This approach addresses BC Hydro's concern, which I share, that the respondent will continue to abuse the right of access by making further systematic requests.¹⁰¹

[96] Finally, I note that in addition to his access requests, the respondent has been sending BC Hydro a large volume of correspondence. For the sake of clarity, BC Hydro does not need authorization from the OIPC under s. 43 to disregard correspondence to which it is not obliged to reply under Parts 2 and 3 of FIPPA.

CONCLUSION

[97] For the reasons provided above, I make the following authorization under s. 43:

1. BC Hydro is authorized to disregard the Outstanding Requests.
2. BC Hydro is also authorized to disregard any access requests made between May 5, 2026 and the date of this authorization.
3. For a period of one year from the date of this authorization, BC Hydro is authorized to disregard any access request made by, or on behalf of, the respondent.

October 5, 2026

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Carol Pakkala
Adjudicator

OIPC File No.: F26-01187

⁹⁸ See, e.g., *Mazhero v. British Columbia (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, 1998 CanLII 6010 (BC SC) at paras 27-32.

⁹⁹ In *Crocker*, *supra* note 19, the BC Supreme Court found that one of the remedies the Commissioner imposed – allowing the public body to disregard all requests from a respondent for a year – was “wholly disproportionate and clearly wrong”, and would have set it aside. However, the Court went on to find that such a remedy could be warranted where the requests were made habitually, persistently, and in bad faith. In my view, the circumstances here are of the habitual and persistent type as contemplated by the Court in *Crocker*.

¹⁰⁰ For similar reasoning, see Order F24-65, 2024 BCIPC 75 (CanLII) at para 43.

¹⁰¹ Order F26-79, 2026 BCIPC 98 (CanLII) at para 120.

Appendix “A” to Order F26-85

The Earlier Requests

There have been 12 Earlier Requests, including multi-part requests, for the following types of records:¹⁰²

- **Project records:** all records including the BC One Call document and the insurance policy and certificate of insurance; all external and internal investigations into the Project;
- **Trouble Call records:** all records including field notes, inspection reports, and crew logs, safety watch documentation, civil inspection notes, photographs referenced in internal emails, any backfill or safety coordination directives, voltage confirmation documentation, internal correspondence between [named individuals];
- **Duct bank records:** Form 30M33; as-built drawings, construction records, and engineering designs showing its configuration; engineering or civil construction specifications; hazard assessments, safety bulletins or internal reviews of excavation over or near it; communications notifying occupants, owners, tenants or operators served by it of a planned or actual electrical isolation; any records about whether it supplied electrical service to the Project address; any records about the facilities it served; internal emails or correspondence between [named individuals] referencing the duct bank; service connection or customer service records; single-line diagrams; load designation or facility identification; system asset management (SAM) records confirming the energized status including field verification records, logs, digital entries or screenshots generated by [named individuals] or responding crews; infrastructure mapping or circuit identification records;
- **Incident records:** about all external and internal investigations; reports, photographs or documents; internal emails or correspondence between [named individuals] referencing the Incident; the electrical-single line diagram and live line status confirmation or operational logs; any documentation indicating the status of the line at the construction site; post-Incident risk assessments, safety reviews, or internal summaries;
- **General safety records:** all records about safety intervention, third party review and investigation into the management, oversight, and disclosure practices for high-risk civil construction projects; safety or criticality classification records; policies and procedures governing third party excavation; records describing BC Hydro’s internal processes for

¹⁰² This description of the types of records comes from the Manager’s affidavit at paras 35-74 which attach as Exhibits, the respondent’s emails requesting access to these records. I have done my best to describe the different types of records requested from all of the respondent’s lengthy emails.

responding when unauthorized construction is identified over energized infrastructure; and

- **BC Hydro submission to BCUC records:** all attachments, appendices, exhibits and supporting documentation, internal drafts, internal correspondence, briefing notes, memoranda, or emails related to the preparation.

The access requests at issue (the Outstanding Requests)

To support its s. 43 application, BC Hydro provides a summary¹⁰³ and a table setting out the specific details¹⁰⁴ of each of the Outstanding Requests. BC Hydro also provides the emails from the respondent containing the Outstanding Requests.¹⁰⁵

After reviewing all of the information about the Outstanding Requests, due to their length, I have summarized them in the table that follows.¹⁰⁶ Many of them also contain lengthy comments, questions, and other details. I only describe them in so far as they are requests for access to records. Further, I only describe them to the extent necessary for deciding the s. 43 issues.¹⁰⁷

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
1	March 20, 2026 (2 emails) March 23, 2026 (2 emails)	Duct bank records: all records including GIS mapping, feeder diagrams, service connection data, maps, diagrams, system data; SAM mapping, unit testing, exports, map screenshots or GIS layers showing its alignment and connection to distribution circuits in the vicinity; diagrams or documentation showing its integration into the feeder serving the Project address; supporting documentation showing connection points, transformer, or other infrastructure linking it to the Project site; service connection records; internal testing or verification results and records identifying the personnel responsible for that testing; emails, letters, or notices warning of planned or actual electrical isolation or service interruption; maps used to notify the property or municipality; any communications or documentation provided to affected parties regarding the energized

¹⁰³ BC Hydro's initial submission at paras 69-79.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, Schedule A.

¹⁰⁵ Manager's affidavit, Exhibits V, W, X, Y, AA, BB, CC, DD, EE, GG, HH, II, JJ, KK, and LL.

¹⁰⁶ The chronological numbers are for ease of later reference in this order. Where appropriate, I group some emails together under a single request number because the respondent's emails indicate they are follow-up clarification requests of his earlier emails.

¹⁰⁷ The requests are each quite lengthy, so I have summarized them here. Where the language used in the request is important for my analysis below, I have quoted the request directly. In these instances, the requests are in quotation marks.

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
		status, outages, or safety precautions related to it; verification outputs, QA reports, testing logs, and audit documentation showing its energized status; work orders, field logs, outage requests, or formal documentation showing it was de-energized, isolated, or otherwise altered for the Project; diagrams, SAM exports, GIS layers, or related records confirming which properties were supplied by it.
2	March 26, 2026 April 1, 2026 (2 emails) April 2, 2026 April 5, 2026	Duct bank records: electrical drawings, single-line diagrams, or as-built plants; switching orders, outage records, or lockout/tagout documentation; ADA logs or energization status reports; inspection reports, field verification records, or hazard assessments; internal correspondence or engineering assessments referencing its operational status; planned outage notices or switching orders; internal emails or notices communicating that power was to be isolated or work was to proceed safely near it; switching logs or outage records for circuit; field crew instructions, tailboards, or safety coordination records; any notifications issued to contractors, municipalities, or third parties regarding electrical isolation or hazard conditions; all records, including updates and previously undisclosed materials relating to it including asset identification and mapping records; all records showing its alignment, and extent; GIS mapping records including SAM or equivalent systems; records confirming whether it was energized and its voltage classification and operational status; records identifying whether it provides electrical service to the Project address; any associated feeder, distribution, or service connection records; excavation or exposure records; records relating to the excavation, storm installation or civil construction near it; risk assessments, safety reviews, or compliance actions, coordination with contractors or municipalities; any notices, letters, emails or advisories sent to the Project address or nearby properties; any records related to planned or potential power isolation, outage notices, switching orders, or service interruption planning; any safety warnings or advisories related to work near it; safety watch or restricted access requirements; internal communications including emails, notes, and reports discussing identification or ownership of the duct bank, safety concerns, or decisions regarding notification; all

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
		records authored, received, or referenced by the following individuals [7 named individuals] including all records relating to SAM system interpretation, its identification, and civil construction and safety concerns; all updated records; all previously undisclosed records; any records not identified in prior responses. Trouble call records: all related records including field reports, inspections, and internal communications, all records documenting results, findings, or conclusions derived from SAM system review, including emails stating “from what I can tell on SAM...” or similar interpretations; records identifying the duct bank in the Trouble Call, its location, condition or status; communications discussing uncertainty (e.g. “is this actually ours or not”) and discrepancies between field observations and system records
3	March 7, 2026	Duct bank records: all records that may have impacted it including identification, engineering approvals, high voltage permits, field inspections, communications with municipal engineers, contractors or subcontractors; utility conflict reports or utility coordination reports identifying it; engineering drawings showing its location in the Project area; records of field inspections; internal communications discussing identification of it, inspection findings or compliance issues Project records: records of engineering approvals or site visits; high voltage safety permits issued; correspondence regarding permit applications or approvals; records verifying that electrical professional were on site during excavation; records of contractor qualifications submitted to BC Hydro; safe work procedures and training documentation submitted by contractors for excavation work; subcontractor engagement and approvals; emails, memoranda, letters, or reports between BC Hydro, municipal engineers, contractors, or subcontractors regarding excavation activities and safety;
4	March 29, 2026	Duct bank records: all records created, sent, or received by [named individuals] about its SAM unit tests including all results, observations, and test notes; verification or confirmation that it was energized; all associated documentation including but not limited to field memos or worksheets, emails or internal

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
		correspondence, trouble tickets, trouble call records, or logs; photos, sketches or diagrams; notes or reports submitted to supervisors or project managers; SAM historical logs; any alternative records that confirm energization or testing of it
5	April 8, 2026	Duct bank records: confirmation that it was energized during the Project; any documentation, permits or correspondence authorizing work over it; all relevant documentation, records, or confirmations.
6	April 18, 2026	Project records: all emails, messages, and correspondence between BC Hydro and subcontractor relating to excavation activities, proximity to the duct bank, and site safety coordination and hazard mitigation; safety direction and procedure related communications including any high voltage safety procedures or requirements; safe excavation practices near energized infrastructure; stop-work orders, hazard mitigation, or corrective actions; Trouble call records: communications involving BC Hydro field staff; all emails or written communications sent or received by BC Hydro field or operations staff; instructions, observations, or safety discussions with Project subcontractor; coordination of excavation safety or electrical hazard response; post-call contractor compliance requirements; internal BC Hydro coordination emails discussing BC Hydro's staff interaction with Project subcontractor or interpretation of site conditions or electrical infrastructure status or decisions regarding contractor safety instructions or escalation
7	April 27, 2026	Incident records: report submitted by Project subcontractor; all high-voltage safe work procedures provided to or submitted by that subcontractor; all associated records, including but not limited to metadata and audit logs showing creation, modification, and upload dates of the above documents; communications between BC Hydro and Project subcontractor about it; any internal reviews, assessments, or compliance evaluations.
8	May 5, 2026	General safety records: contractor oversight, safety management system, and high-voltage excavation controls in connection with civil construction work involving energized or potentially energized electrical infrastructure; contractor governance and

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
		subcontracting oversight including all policies governing subcontracting by prime contractors; requirements for disclosure, approval or tracking of subcontractors; contractor prequalification and qualification standards; audits or compliance reviews of contractor or subcontractor performance; any records showing BC Hydro awareness of downstream subcontracting arrangements; all records relating to BC Hydro's safety rules and procedures for civil excavation near underground electrical infrastructure including: electrical safety rules and safe work procedures applicable to excavation, minimum approach distance requirements for excavation near energized assets, requirements for hydro-vac or hand excavation near duct banks, job safety analysis requirements for excavation near electrical infrastructure, utility locate, clearance, and permit-to-work systems, requirements for safety orientation or hazard training for contractor personnel; all records related to the authorization of excavation work near underground electrical infrastructure, including utility locate records e.g. BC One Call documentation, excavation permits or work packages, electrical clearance, switching orders, or authorization records; any deviation approvals from standard excavation safety procedures; field inspection reports; contractor safety audits; compliance monitoring of excavation activities; corrective action reports issued to contractors, stop-work orders or safety interventions, monitoring of subcontractor safety compliance; all records relating to hear-miss and hazard reporting, incidents or near-misses involving excavation near high-voltage infrastructure; safety performance reports relevant to contractor excavation work; risk management reports involving underground electrical infrastructure; capital project risk registers involving excavation near electrical assets; governance documents describing contractor safety oversight systems; communications or filings to the BCUC relating to contractor safety or excavation risk; all communications between BC Hydro and relevant contractors regarding excavation safety requirements near energized infrastructure; subcontracting obligations and approvals; worker competency, training,

Request	Date	Summary of Requests
		or safety orientation requirements; electrical hazard management and clearance procedures. Duct bank records: mark-out drawing showing locations; hazard reports involving exposure or electrical risk; internal investigations or safety reviews; communications with WorkSafeBC.